

Name - MOHAMMAD RASHID RAZA
 Enrollment No - 194505382
 Program Code - MAPY
 Course Code - MPYE-003

Question 1 Explain the criteria of truth accepted in Indian philosophy and discuss various Khyativadas.

Indian philosophy system accept the ~~intuitionist~~ intuitionist theory in Samkhya in respect to both truth and error while Mimamsa and Advaita vedanta systems accept it in the case of truth. ~~but not~~ According to Samkhya both truth and falsity are internal characters of different cases of knowledge. If one knowledge is true and another false that is so because of their own internal condition and without reference to any external test. Truth is latent in some cognitions and errors in others, from the very first moment of their occurrence and these are immediately apprehended by us at that moment.

The Mimamsa and Advaita vedanta however take truth as intrinsic to all knowledge. Savatah pramanyo and error as an abnormal phenomenon due to certain external and violating factors in the conditions of some cognitions, Paratah a pramanya. While truth is intrinsic and organic to knowledge, falsity or error is accidental and externally conditioned. Any cognition is true so far as it reveals its object and it is immediately known to be true so far as it is uncontradicted, abadhita.

The Correspondence theory of truth and error hold the truth consists in correspondence to fact and is indirectly verified by experience. But the Nyaya view of truth is logical and agrees the correspondence theory. For Nyaya truth consist of Correspondence, but the criterion is coherence in broad sense, Samvada.

Khyati vadas - This theory of apprehension, if all knowledge is said to be right knowledge and therefore valid, how are we to explain the occurrence of illusion in the world. Right knowledge of reality as it is and that leads to successful activity. It is distinguished from erroneous cognition which does not end in such successful activity. It must be understood at the outset that in regards to the illumination of an object there is no difference between prama right knowledge and aprama false knowledge. But right knowledge differ from erroneous knowledge in respect of the difference of the volitional and emotional aspects of the percipient's personality. There are five Khyativada as Indian theories of error.

1) Atmakhyati - (Human Soul) - It is known internally. Cognition and its object are not different. An imagined external object is also of the nature of Cognition.

2) Asatkhyati - Since all the elements are unreal, the view is called asatkhyati. The followers of Hinduism accept the erroneous cognition of object such as the sky-flower the son of a barren women.

3) Akhyati - The Term akhyati means absence of error. Prothakara is the proponent of the theory of akhyati. He does not accept illusory cognition. In fact there is no error.

4) Anyathakhyati - This is also known as vipariṭakhyati. The Nyaya Vaiseshika School of Indian philosophy have accepted anyathakhyati.

5) Anirvacanīyakhyati - Anirvacanīya means something can be described. Sankara propounded the Advaitavada the theory of non-dualism by establishing Brahman as the ultimate locus of cosmic illusion.

These are the five theories of khyati vada to understand the truth and error in Indian philosophy.

Question 2 Define certitude. Explain various kinds of certitudes possible.

Certitude as the firm assent of the mind to the truth, based on the evidence. In simple language justification of knowledge which certifies the truth is called certitude.

The notion of certitude as conviction adds to the notions of awareness, the Scholastic firm assent but not so much as an act performed here and now but rather as a psychological state of mind resulting from it.

Certitude gives a firm assent to a judgement without fear of the possibility of error due to recognised valid reasons. Three elements enter into the concept of certitude: the firm assent to the judgement, the absence of fear of possible error, and the understanding of the valid reason which exclude this fear.

Often we become aware of so many opinions given on certain matters, one saying this and another saying completely different and contrary to the first that one is tempted to despair of knowing what to believe any longer. In a sense it is true, one is either certain or one is not. Strictly speaking it would make no sense to say that I am more or less convinced. What I am really saying is that I have a strong opinion on that matter but I am not yet convinced. As we have distinguished between the state of mind implied by saying that one has an opinion and that implied by saying that one is convinced.

If certitude is based on evidence, we prefer to distinguish between the different kind of possible and expected certitude on the basis both of the different fields of knowledge and consequently of the different kind of evidence. There are ~~three~~ four kind of certitude possible.

1) Logical certitude - Here ~~we~~ we are in the field of formal field of knowledge, the realm of pure ideas and the relationship between them. as in logic and mathematics. The evidence of the truth of the propositions is obtained by analysis of the terms and definitions used. No other means of verification is needed or indeed possible. Here the truth is expressed in analytical propositions which are therefore necessary true propositions and can be seen to be such even before their application to other fields of knowledge. And the certitude thus based on such kind of evidence, admitting of no possible or conceivable exception, can be called absolute. I am absolutely certain that if $A = B$ and $B = C$, then $A = C$. I am similarly certain that $2 + 2 = 4$. Again I am similarly certain that it is either raining or not raining. Similarly with definitions; I am certain in the same way that if I define a rational animal as man, then that man is a rational animal is for me absolutely certain.

2) Ontological certitude - Here we are in the field of informal knowledge of being as being the realm of visible and tangible realities but considered from the point of view of those characteristics which they have in common to extent that they are beings, existents. This realm could be considered

as the counterpart, as it were of the logical realm. if we are ~~prepared~~ prepared to admit as we pointed out before that the law of the mind the logical realm are based on the laws of being itself. The evidence of the truth of the judgement is obtained, certainly first from general experience (including sense experience, but more directly from a reflection on the nature of the judgement itself as judgement for sure there could be other methods, but ultimately certain law of being itself ~~or judgement~~ can be insightfully discovered, what we called first principle which not only are self evident. The self evidence in question here, however is not merely logical but ontological and the contradiction would not be one of the terms but a judgmental one.

3) physical Certitude - Here we are in the field of the knowledge of the things, of their properties and ways of acting the realm therefore of science. The evidence of the truth of the law of nature is obtained by first of all sense perception, verification or falsification by laboratory - conducted experiments of hypotheses formed etc. Here the opposite of a given law is not at least theoretically inconceivable. Its truth is subject to our further understanding of how nature works. So to say. In this field of only possible certitude we can have and the only one to be expected is physical certitude. It is not absolute by hypothetical in the sense that I can say, yes I am sure on the possible evidence given so far. Hence I can say I am sure certain, that the sun will rise from the east, that action and reaction are equal and opposite that the volume of gas at constant temperature varies inversely with the pressure etc.

4) Moral Certitude - ~~also~~ Here we have to be careful for unlike the previous usage of the term certain which is a philosophical technical one the usage of the term to be morally sure is also an everyday common one. we often use such expressions as I am morally sure that the exam is postponed till next month by which is meant that I am pretty sure that, I have good strong reasons to believe that. So we have distinguished between at least three meanings of moral certitude.

5) Religious Certitude - Here we are in the field of religious knowledge. But a lot have first to be said before we can adequately tackle the nature of religious certitude, the kind of evidence on which it is based how we go about obtaining such evidence the nature of religious truth and kind of language it is expressed in. ~~we have said so far in this~~

shan3

A

Elaborate on ideal language philosophy and ordinary language philosophy?
Ideal language philosophy was an artificial language constructed with the help of modern logical tools; especially those of predicate logic wherein its variables can be quantified. This is to solve some of the hard philosophical problems like that of existence and identity. Since this language is modeled on symbolic logic it is precise non-ambiguous and reveals a structure that is able to accurately represent the description that language makes.

Though there were limitation of arriving at unique description with the help of logical tools it did help in rethinking the relation between logic, language and reality. To compound this situation there also developed new kind of logic like three-valued logic and modal logic the pictured world.

Ordinary language philosophy - it is ordinary way to understand the solve the philosophical problems. In world of Moore this is common sense beliefs.

In this sense of how we understand them in our ordinary language and argues for their certainty, thus claiming that these are not only true but also that we know them to be true. He believes that philosopher's role is to analyse our ordinary understanding of terms and not their truth. There could be different theories on the true nature of the object but one should never deny our ordinary ways of knowing things about external world.

Ordinary language have very faithful and fruitful relations with philosophy and philosophical problems. Through it is harder for philosophical language to connect to the ordinary world than for the ordinary world to connect to the language of science for instance. It is much harder to defend the unreality and illusory content of the world than the real world of ordinary discourse.

Questions

Q.C

Discuss the three component of hermeneutical enterprise.

The Greek word ~~hermeneutikos~~ Hermeneutikos meant to express, explain, translate or interpret the sacred message. Originally, it was discussed in the Greek philosophy. Hermeneutics through its a methods and principle sees the text or the object in interpretation in present context. Traditionally, hermeneutics has been divided into two categories. They are General Hermeneutics - concerned with generalities such as context, language, history and culture and Second Hermeneutics concerned with specifics such as figure of speech, symbols, poetry, prophecy, typology, doctrinal teaching and various literary forms.

The growth of hermeneutics attests that there is a movement from the interpretations of the text to understanding of understanding; existence and life-world. Therefore, the author, the text and the reader are the three basic components of any hermeneutical enterprise. However, language and other elements cannot be ignored in hermeneutics. Following are the three types of Hermeneutical enterprise.

1) The Capacity of the Text - The text in the strict sense of hermeneutics is the key component. Text generally understood as that stretch of written language which has a beginning and end. In a metaphorical sense text can be extended even to include message generated by sign-system of various religious, economic, social etc. structures, non verbal body indicator etc. Text is the basis on which the operations of hermeneutics take place. One of the definition states that, "A text is a group of entities used as sign, selected, arranged and intended by an author to convey a specific meaning to an audience in a certain context". It can be written, printed text or the text of mental images too. Text has many uses such as expressing emotions, issuing commands, eliciting answers, making request, causing actions etc. Text cause the understandings;

The author and reader both part of text but both are eclipsed in some sense for reader is absent in the act of writing and author is absent in the act of reading. The text therefore assumes greater role in transforming its readers.

2) The Capacity of the reader / Interpreter - The reader too has an impact on the text being influenced by the text and influencing the text. Every reader brings a horizon of expectation to the text. Horizon of expectation is a mind set or system of references, which characterised the reader's finite view point amidst his or her situatedness in time and history. From the reader's points of view, there is always a attempt to understand the intention of the author at the same time, and to understand the text in itself. However, the reader cannot undo the situation or background on which he bases his ~~understanding~~ reading. This interplay exists in understanding the text always. There are six different levels where the reader influences the text and its meaning. They are inter-textual, situational, horizontal, semiotic

hermeneutical and theoretical frameworks, the interpreter in four ways changes the object of interpretation be it text or anything that can be interpreted. They are done through idealising the object of interpretation, re-segmenting the object of interpretation, re-conceiving the object of interpretation and through recovering and underlying object.

3) The Capacity of the author. — The author cannot be ignored in the hermeneutics. It is his worldview, unconsciously comes into the text and affects the texts. An author cannot disassociate himself from his historical condition. He feeds both the actual meaning and intended meaning into the text. However the text has traces of his world view and his times, which can be traced through hermeneutics.

Question 4
A

Explain the concept of paradigm.

The term paradigm has been first used by Kuhn in two senses. First of all it stand for the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques and so on shared by the members of a given community. Second paradigm denotes one sort of element in that constellation, the concrete puzzle-solutions which, employed as models or examples can replace explicit rules as a basis for the solution of the remaining puzzles of normal sciences. Since Kuhn was within the framework of normal science, he has applied the understanding of paradigm to natural science. Kuhn emphasises on the second understanding of paradigm as deeper for it gives a place for new framework. The second important aspect to notice in the understanding of a paradigm is the notion of the community structure who share a particular paradigm. It is circular in its relations to a community, because paradigm shared by a scientific community and scientific community consist of individuals who share paradigm.

A few insight can be gained from the analysis of paradigm by Kuhn. They can be classified as following and can be applied to linguistic turn as a paradigm shift.

- 1) In an established paradigm, all problem looked from a particular framework, which in turn determine the nature and solution of a problem.
- 2) The period of such status quo, the normal science, has problems with those empirical data which defy the existing paradigmatic frameworks.
- 3) The attempt to never solution to the problem come as the paradigm shift when in the older problems are understood in a new light.
- 4) This result in the revolution in science where in stray phenomena of established framework become the example/model of new framework.
- 5) New paradigm rules the science for a period of time until the anomalies are found to be answered with shift in the paradigm.

Explain the debate between internalism and externalism?

Addresses people in ability to identify their justification responsive to the issue of being justified and being able to identify justification are respectively called externalism and internalism. Internalist theory try to account for justified through appeal to internal features of S, and externalism theory try to do the same through appeal to external feature of S.

Internalism — Internalist position will restrict justifies to items that are within the subject. Now the issue turns on what kind of access a thinker has to the feature in question. In this literature of internalism, we find two senses in which the phrase is used.

- (1) Being within the subject's perspective (formal internalism)
- (2) Being accessible to the subject in some special way. (access internalism)

Externalism - Externalism represents a substantial departure from its general tradition. Externalists claim that although there must indeed exist a reason why a basic empirical belief is likely to be true, the person for whom the belief is basic need not himself have the cognitive grasp of the reason. According to them epistemic justification of a basic belief derives from obtaining of an appropriate relation, causal or nomological between the believer and the world. If truth is an epistemic goal we may define justification in terms of this goal. Some relationship to the external world accounting for the truth of our belief suffices to convert true belief into knowledge without our having any idea of that relationship. It is not our conception of how we are related to a fact that yields knowledge but simply our being so related to it.

90 Briefly describe the ordinary language philosophy of G.E. Moore.

Ordinary way to understand the solve the philosophical problems - In concern with the use of expressions in ordinary language, providing philosophical comfort is first seen in G.E. Moore's discussion of analysis and the role of common sense belief in his paper. 'Defense of common sense in year 1925 and proof of external world in year (1939)'. Moore uses the term "common sense beliefs" in the sense of how we understand them in our ordinary language and argues for their certainty, thus claiming that there are not only true but also that we know them to be true. He believed that a philosopher's role is to analyse our ordinary understanding of term and not their truth. There could be different theories on the true nature of the object but one should never deny our ordinary ways of knowing the things about the external world. He defends a common sense description of the world based on an indirect argument that logicians often use to support their basic premise. This is done by showing that the negation of the premise leads to a contradiction (in the case of self-contradiction) and therefore the premise be held true.

Moore list a set of truism that begin with all the statements one can truly make about oneself in terms of physical and mental facts that could be extended to include the past as well as future. One could begin with the exists at present a living human body which is my body and all facts concerning this statement.

Moore tries to claim the world lost by idealists and ~~so~~ sceptics who have either denied the existence of the empirical world or cannot know it with certainty.

46 what are the main streams that helped in the development of the linguistic turn in philosophy?

The linguistic turn in philosophy aims at arriving at truth through the analysis of language. Initially the language philosophy school was anti metaphysical in its outlook. It is influenced by the logical positivism of the Vienna circle and their scientific bent on verification. Another important presupposition in linguistic philosophy is the shift of discussion from reality to that which describes the reality, namely the language. Language philosophy assumes that the language reflects the reality. Hence the language is the efficient tool to know, to understand the reality through its description and through the analysis of its logical syntax.

Hence linguistic turn aims to at describing the world by describing a suitable language. language is a method according to this school of philosophy.

Linguistic turn didn't occurs within one day. It was a longer reflection and growth in field such as phenomenology, existentialism, logic etc gave rise to linguistic turn. However few major trends contributed to develop the turn.

1) Frege and Meinong - philosophical tradition in Germany

2) Moore, Russell and Wittgenstein - English speaking tradition.

C

Language Game - Language game is unique to the 20th century linguistic philosophy. After the drastic turn in philosophical approach, where in language became the focus of philosophy, the analytical mode of philosophizing gained its importance. The century old philosophical problems were looked from the language perspective and hence language became the focal point of philosophical analysis.

A sentence proposition does presuppose a language game, but a language game will be only a small segment of the whole of language. The example for such notion appears in the mason and his helper. It is not the mere words, but the totality of signs and symbols within the framework of construction of building gives meaning to the language. In comparison with the higher, complex language, this language may appear as lower. But it has own language game, in which the element of language make sense.

F

Epistemic Justification - Epistemic justification is a normative notion. It is regarding the belief which leads to knowledge. The norms which govern the beliefs; rules describing the circumstances under which it is epistemically permissible to hold beliefs are called epistemic norms. Epistemic condition is necessary condition for knowledge. In other words, epistemic justification in some way hits at the foundations of knowledge or source of knowledge. In this regards epistemic theories can be categorized as;

1) Doxastic theories which include foundation theory and coherence theory.

2) Non-Doxastic theories which includes internalism and externalism, which also have its subcategories like reliabilism and probabilism.

G.H

Postulation (Arthapatti) - This is a unique source of knowledge upheld by the Mimamsikas. In other words the Mimamsikas expressed arthapatti as a valid method of cognition. Arthapatti is combination of two words artha and apati. The term artha means fact and apati means kalpana or supposition. Thus etymologically speaking arthapatti is the knowledge which resolve the conflicts between two facts. It entails a presupposition which solve the problem that occurred between two facts.

Arthapatti is the assumption of an unperceived fact in order to reconcile two apparently inconsistent perceived facts. When a known fact can't be accounted without another fact, we have to postulate the existence of third fact. The valid and justified knowledge of the third fact is known as postulation.

B

Fallibilism - Fallibilism is that some part of accepted knowledge claims, could be wrong or at least flawed. In the case of global skepticism, if there are not certain claims providing support to all our other claims then our entire knowledge base is put into doubt and we don't actually know anything. In contrast, a fallibilist is not so quick to discount the possibility of having knowledge. For fallibilist, the lack of absolute certainty does not undermine our ability to know the truth of some particular claims. Fallibilists are willing to accept a justified claim as true until it is shown to be false. The idea is not as radical as some found in philosophy. Since often human knowledge is founded on observed interactions that could be interpreted incorrectly. Many times our misunderstanding of the world is found to be fallible, not perfect and we

discovers mistake after new empirical observation are made.

E Nominalism — Nominalism means the rejection of ~~universals~~ Universals, in other words it implies the rejection of abstract objects. Nominalism is not simply the rejection of universals or abstract objects. For if that were the case a nihilist, ~~some~~ someone who believed that there are no entity at all, would count as a nominalist. Similarly, someone who rejected universals or abstract object but were agnostic about the existence of particular or concrete object would count as a nominalist. Hence, there are two types of Nominalism, One that maintain that there are no universals and other that maintain that there are no abstract objects. Realism about universals is the doctrine that there are universals, and Platonism is the doctrine that there ~~are~~ are abstract objects.